

1 Todd M. Friedman (216752)
2 Adrian R. Bacon (280332)
3 Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman, P.C.
4 21031 Ventura Blvd., Suite 340
5 Woodland Hills, CA 91364
6 Phone: 323-306-4234
7 Fax: 866-633-0228
8 tfriedman@toddflaw.com
9 abacon@toddflaw.com
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
12 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 ARI SCHWARTZ, individually, and
14 on behalf of all others similarly
15 situated,

16 Plaintiff,

17 vs.

18 TESLA, INC., and DOES 1-10
19 Inclusive,

20 Defendant.

) Case No. 8:24-cv-00750-ODW (KESx)

)

) **NOTICE OF VOLUNTARY**

) **DISMISSAL**

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

1 NOW COMES THE PLAINTIFF by and through his attorneys to
2 respectfully move this Honorable Court to dismiss this matter with prejudice as to
3 Plaintiff's individual claims and without prejudice as to the putative class claims.
4 Defendant did not file an answer or a motion for summary judgment at this time,
5 and no Court order is necessary pursuant to the Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule
6 41(a)(1)(A)(i).

7 Plaintiff hereby provides the Court with the following information to
8 ensure that the dismissal in this matter is not collusive or prejudicial to the
9 putative class under *Diaz v. Tr. Territory of Pac. Islands*, 876 F.2d 1401, 1408
10 (9th Cir. 1989)

11 Pursuant to Rule 23(e), "the district court should inquire into possible
12 prejudice from (1) class members' possible reliance on the filing of the action if
13 they are likely to know of it either because of publicity or other circumstances, (2)
14 lack of adequate time for class members to file other actions, because of a rapidly
15 approaching statute of limitations, (3) any settlement or concession of class
16 interests made by the class representative or counsel in order to further their own
17 interests." *Diaz v. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands*, *supra*, 1408.

18 The *Diaz* factors do not apply to the facts of this case, but even if they did,
19 dismissal is nonetheless proper. In 1989, the Ninth Circuit held in *Diaz* that Rule
20 23(e) applies prior to class certification. 876 F.2d at 1408. At that time, Rule 23
21 provided that "[a] class action shall not be dismissed or compromised without the
22 approval of the court" Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e) (as amended Mar. 2, 1987, eff.
23 Aug. 1, 1987). Under *Diaz*, the district court evaluating dismissal is to "inquire
24 into possible prejudice from (1) class members' possible reliance on the filing of
25 the action if they are likely to know of it either because of publicity or other
26 circumstances, (2) lack of adequate time for class members to file other actions,
27 because of a rapidly approaching statute of limitations, (3) any settlement or
28

1 concession of class interests made by the class representative or counsel in order
2 to further their own interests.” 876 F.2d at 1408 (citations omitted).

3 Notably, *Diaz* was decided prior to amendments to Rule 23(e), which
4 clarified that Rule 23(e) applies to certified classes or settlement classes.
5 Specifically, Rule 23(e) now provides that “[t]he claims, issues, or defenses of a
6 *certified class*—or a *class proposed to be certified for purposes of settlement*”
7 may be settled or voluntarily dismissed “only with the court’s approval.” Fed. R.
8 Civ. P. 23(e) (emphasis added); *see also Lee v. CVS Pharmacy, Inc.*, No. 3:20-cv-
9 01923-BEN-DEB, 2021 WL 308283, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2021)
10 (acknowledging that “in 2003, the Congress revised Rule 23 to make clear that
11 court approval is only required in a putative class action where the plaintiff seeks
12 to approve a settlement of both individual and class claims”); 7B Charles Alan
13 Wright & Arthur R. Miller, Fed. Prac. & Proc., *Settlement, Voluntary Dismissal,*
14 *or Compromise of Class Actions* § 1797 (3d ed. 2021) (“settlements or voluntary
15 dismissals that occur before class certification are outside the scope of
16 subdivision (e)”). Accordingly, because no class has been certified, Rule 23(e)
17 does not apply. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e).

18 Nevertheless, even if the Court were to apply the *Diaz* factors to these
19 circumstances, dismissal would be proper. *First*, it is unlikely that any putative
20 class members have relied on the action to protect their interests, nor anything
21 suggesting reliance on Plaintiff’s claims. This action has not been publicized in
22 any way and as such, the putative class members are highly unlikely to have
23 knowledge of it, or to have relied upon it in any way. Similarly, Plaintiff’s
24 counsel is unaware of any other circumstances that may have led to the putative
25 class’s knowledge of, or reliance upon, this action. Plaintiff’s counsel has not
26 contacted any putative class members in any form, nor have any putative class
27 members communicated with Plaintiff’s counsel in any form. *Second*, no class
28 has been certified. Investigation indicated that Plaintiff’s claims arose from facts

1 individual to Plaintiff, which likely did not affect other persons, and which may
2 have been subject to an individual arbitration agreement. As such, the rights of
3 the putative class remain unaffected independent of the individual dismissal of
4 Plaintiff's claims. *Third*, as discussed above, there is no settlement or concession
5 of putative class interests given that there has been no settlement or compromise
6 of any kind related to any potential class claims asserted in the Complaint. Even
7 under *Diaz*, dismissal is clearly proper here.

8 Thus, *Diaz* should not stand as a barrier to dismissal, given the subsequent
9 amendments to Rule 23(e) and the facts of this case in which there is no
10 settlement or compromise of any class claims, no collusion, and no potential
11 prejudice to any putative class member. Moreover, the dismissal as to any
12 putative class members would be *without prejudice*.

13 For these reasons, Plaintiff requests that this Court enter a dismissal of this
14 action with prejudice as to the named Plaintiff and without prejudice as to the
15 putative class.

16
17 Respectfully submitted this 15th Day of July, 2024,

18
19 By: s/ Todd M. Friedman Esq.
20 Todd M. Friedman
21 Attorney for Plaintiff
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Filed electronically on July 15, 2024 with:

United States District Court CM/ECF system

Notification sent electronically on July 15, 2024, to:

To the Honorable Court, all parties and their Counsel of Record

By: s/ Todd M. Friedman Esq.
Todd M. Friedman
Attorney for Plaintiff